



## Feedback Report for June 10, 2015 Achievement and Accountability Workgroup (AAW) Meeting

### Summary

On June 10, 2015, an AAW meeting was held to discuss the transition of the accountability system and the Achievement Index during the initial administration of the Smarter Balanced assessment system. The meeting was held as a webinar.

This feedback report is assembled from verbal discussion during the webinar and nine feedback forms that were received at the end of the webinar. The discussion and feedback forms were framed around the following guiding questions. The feedback is summarized under each guiding question. More specific feedback can be found in the "Feedback in Greater Detail" section of this document.

- What is your view on rolling the 2012-13 SGPs forward into the 2014-15 Index for the SBAC Field Test schools?
  - The majority of participants agreed that rolling forward the 2012-2013 SGPs into the 2014-15 Index for the SBAC Field Test schools was alright, but warned that those schools should receive safe harbor (i.e. be held harmless in negative effects from the roll forward).
- What is your view on taking a "pause" on the Priority and Focus School identifications?
  - The majority of participants agreed that a "pause" would be acceptable but cautioned that it should be called "maintenance" or something other than a "pause" and that schools that request supports should be able to receive help.
- Do you believe the three content area assessments comprising the Proficiency indicator should continue to be equally weighted?
  - The majority of participants stated that English Language Arts should be given greater weighting and cautioned that science was weighted too heavily. However, there was no consensus on the specific weighting and several suggestions were offered.
- Do you believe the Growth Indicator weighting for high school should be lowered, given that the HS SGP would have to become a 3-year measure?
  - The majority of AAW members stated that the weight for growth should remain equal to the other indicators.
- How should the Indicator weightings for High Schools be changed to accommodate the inclusion of Dual Credit Participation?
  - The majority of participants stated that Dual Credit should receive little weight but were supportive of incentivizing it. There was not consensus on the specifics of weighting but participants were generally supportive of the proposed weighting of 35% proficiency, 25% growth, and 40% Career and College Readiness (including 5% Dual Credit participation). However, this support of the proposed weighting of only 25% growth is

contradictory to the feedback that the weighting of growth should not be reduced, the suggestion of the majority in response to the question that was specifically about growth.

- Provide feedback on whether you believe a virtual meeting like the one today is effective given the purpose of gathering feedback from participants.
  - AAW members felt that this virtual meeting was a success but noted the drawbacks of using a webinar instead of an in-person meeting.

## Feedback in Greater Detail

### **What is your view on rolling the 2012-13 SGPs forward into the 2014-15 Index for the SBAC Field Test schools?**

The majority of participants agreed that rolling forward the 2012-2013 SGPs into the 2014-15 Index for the SBAC Field Test schools was alright, but warned that those schools should receive safe harbor (i.e. be held harmless in negative effects from the roll forward). One participant raised concern with the meaningfulness of SGPs that roll forward for use in evaluation or planning for improvement. One participant stated that, in reporting the data, it should be made clear that the SGPs were from 2012-2013 and that the list of assessments used be made clear.

### **What is your view on taking a “pause” on the Priority and Focus School identifications?**

The majority of participants agreed that a “pause” would be acceptable but cautioned that it should be called “maintenance” or something other than a “pause” and that schools that request supports should be able to receive help. One participant felt that taking a pause is neither appropriate nor helpful. One participant states that the pause should be left open to modification if data raises concern about schools that appear to need supports. One OSPI staff member stated that they felt that this decision should solely be the responsibility of the SPI and offered the following three suggestions:

- Smarter Balanced assessment should not be combined with MSP/HSPE assessment results for the designation identification of Challenged Schools;
- It would be acceptable to “hit reset” and identify based on only one year of Smarter Balanced results; or
- It would be acceptable to take the pause but that an exit path should be available for schools that make progress during the pause.

### **Do you believe the three content area assessments comprising the Proficiency indicator should continue to be equally weighted?**

The majority of participants stated that English Language Arts should be given greater weighting and cautioned that science was weighted too heavily. However, there was no consensus on the specific weighting and several suggestions were offered. Participants raised concerns that K-8 teachers are not prepared to teach science, science is not assessed at as many grade levels as the other subjects, access to science instruction is inequitable for remote districts, and that the accountability system has failed to incentivize science with equal weighting. Participants noted the importance of reading and writing and

that English Language Arts is currently reflected as 50% in the Achievement Index. One participant suggested weighting based on instructional time and another participant suggested looking at what other states are doing.

Although there was no consensus on the specifics of weighting, the following weightings were discussed:

- 50% ELA, 25% Math, 25% Science was commonly recommended
- 40% ELA, 40% Math, 20% Science was recommended by one participant
- 33% ELA, 33% Math, 33% Science was not recommended by any participant

**Do you believe the Growth Indicator weighting for high school should be lowered, given that the HS SGP would have to become a 3-year measure?**

The majority of AAW members stated that the weight for growth should remain equal to the other indicators. One participant felt that growth being lowered to 25% would be a reasonable option for the next three years. One participant stated that growth at the high school level is less meaningful and the weighting should be lowered in favor of raising the weighting of proficiency and graduation. One participant stated that if reducing the weight of growth would reduce the Index Rating for schools that work under difficult demographic or resource circumstances, then they would oppose it.

**How should the Indicator weightings for High Schools be changed to accommodate the inclusion of Dual Credit Participation?**

The majority of participants stated that Dual Credit should receive little weight but were supportive of incentivizing it. There was not consensus on the specifics of weighting but participants were generally supportive of the proposed weighting of 35% proficiency, 25% growth, and 40% Career and College Readiness (including 5% Dual Credit participation). However, this support of the proposed weighting of only 25% growth is contradictory to the feedback that the weighting of growth should not be reduced, the suggestion of the majority in response to the question that was specifically about growth. One participant raised concern that a local waiver may be needed on Dual Credit until there is access for all students and another participant raised concern that the Dual Credit measure would inequitably affect those who do not have access. Two participants cautioned that Dual Credit should not only include participant, but should also include attainment of credit as a measure of completion. One participant suggested using four-year graduation rate in addition to the five-year measure.

Although the majority were supportive of 35% proficiency, 25% growth, and 40% Career and College Readiness (CCR, including 5% Dual Credit participation), the following alternative weightings were raised in discussion:

- 35% Proficiency, 35% Growth, 30 % CCR
- 33% Proficiency, 33% Proficiency, 33% CCR
- 30% Proficiency, 30% Growth, 40% CCR

**Feedback on whether you believe a virtual meeting like the one today is effective given the purpose of gathering feedback from participants.**

AAW members felt that this virtual meeting was a success but noted the drawbacks of using a webinar instead of an in-person meeting. Four members felt that webinars limit participant interaction but that this meeting was effective. Two members stated that they appreciated being able to attend the meeting without traveling. Other suggestions were to use a webinar format for short meetings and an in-person format for long meetings and that virtual meetings have detrimental implications for equitable participation.

If you have questions about this feedback report, please contact Parker Teed, Operations and Data Coordinator, at [parker.teed@k12.wa.us](mailto:parker.teed@k12.wa.us)

If you have questions about the Achievement Index, please contact Andrew Parr, Senior Policy Analyst, at [andrew.parr@k12.wa.us](mailto:andrew.parr@k12.wa.us)